



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE GOD OF SINAI AND JERUSALEM.

ONE element in the religion of Chaldea has survived in that of Israel. The god of Ur and Harran was the God of Sinai and Jerusalem, of Abraham, of Moses, and of David. If the evidence for this proposition falls somewhat short of proof, it is sufficient to establish a strong presumption, while the hypothesis will be found to illustrate many obscure places of the biblical record, and thereby to receive confirmation. I must not be understood to assert an absolute and original identity, but only that one important source of Israel's faith was, by this channel, derived from the banks of Euphrates. And it is no unworthy ancestry.

"Lord, prince of the gods, *who alone in heaven and earth is exalted*,—father Nannar, *lord of the hosts of heaven*, prince of the gods,—father Nannar, lord, *great Anu*, prince of the gods,—father Nannar, lord, *moon-god*, prince of the gods,—father Nannar, *lord of Uru*, prince of the gods . . .—Lord, thy deity fills the far-off *heavens*, like the vast *sea*, with reverential fear! *Master of the earth*, thou who fixest there the *boundaries* [of the towns] and assignest to them their *names*,—father, *begetter of gods and men*, who establishest for them *dwellings* and institutest for them that which is good, who proclaimest *royalty* and bestowest the exalted sceptre on those whose destiny was determined from distant times,—chief, mighty, whose heart is great, *god whom no one can name*, whose limbs are steadfast, whose knees never bend, who *preparest the paths* of thy brothers the gods . . .—In heaven, who is supreme? As for thee, it is thou alone who art supreme!—As for thee, *thy decree* is made known in *heaven*, and the Igigi bow their faces!—As for thee, thy decree is made known upon *earth*, and the spirits of the abyss kiss the dust!—As for thee, thy decree blows above like the *wind*, and *stall and pasture become fertile*!—As for thee, thy decree is accomplished upon earth below, *and the grass and green things grow*!—As for thee, thy decree is seen in the cattle-

folds and in the lairs of the wild beasts, *and it multiplies living things!*—As for thee, thy decree has called into being *equity* and *justice*, and the peoples have promulgated thy *law!*—As for thee, thy decree, neither in the far-off heaven, nor in the hidden depths of the earth, can any one recognize it!—As for thee, thy decree, who can learn it, who can try conclusions with it?—O Lord, mighty in heaven, sovereign upon earth, among the gods, thy brothers, thou hast no rival.”

I have thought it worth while to quote this magnificent hymn from the *Dawn of Civilization* (pp. 654, 655), and to point out by means of italics the chief attributes assigned to the god. Truly it is a noble creed which is here set forth, and neither in its mythic nor in its ideal elements unworthy to be compared with the higher faith of Israel. “Outside Uru and Harra, Sin did not obtain this rank of creator and ruler of things” (*ibid.*). We have now to establish the points, not merely of resemblance, but of possible and probable connexion between the cultus of those cities and the religion of the Old Testament.

The feast of the New Moon, celebrated in historic times as a feast of Jahveh, affords a distinct presumption of the existence of a lunar element in the concept of the latter. And it is more than probable that the Sabbath also is lunar in its origin, marking the successive phases of the moon. It is well observed in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (art. “Sabbath,” § 6 *versus finem*) “That full moon as well as new moon had a religious significance among the ancient Hebrews seems to follow from the fact that when the great agricultural feasts were fixed to set days, the full moon was chosen.” The same authority observes (§ 1) “The grammatical form of *šabbāth* suggests a transitive sense ‘the divider,’ and apparently indicates the Sabbath as dividing the month. Now compare the language of Gen. i. 14, noting especially להבדיל and לאחת with that of Exod. xxxi. 13: אַךְ אֵת שַׁבְּתֹתַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ כִּי אֵת הָאֵת בֵּינוּ וּבֵינֵיכֶם.”

The phases of the moon, it may be inferred, serve for signs divinely appointed, while the religious celebration of these phases constitutes a sign as between Jahveh and

his people. Prof. Delitzsch traces back the Sabbath to Babylonia (op. cit., pp. 40, 98). I would suggest that its origin may be sought at Uru.

“Your fathers dwelt beyond the River of old time, and served another god¹.” This could be no other than the god of the land of their sojourning, to whom they stood in a relation of clientship; and they sojourned in Ur and Harran². When with this tradition in our minds we take into consideration the circumstance that the grand revelation of the Torah of Jahveh to Israel, the constitution of the nation by the establishment of its *sacra*, is always believed to have taken place in a theophany upon the Mount of God, and that this mountain bore the name of Sinai, the hypothesis of a connexion between Sin and Jahveh is much strengthened. It is further confirmed by the significant facts that (1) the feast of the new moon, “undoubtedly familiar to the ancient Israelites,” is yet “completely ignored in the Book of the Covenant and in Deuteronomy”—in other words (as I formerly observed) it was a part of the national religion, and of the priestly tradition, but was disapproved by the prophetic reformers; and (2) doubtless for a similar reason, the Sinai of J and P appears as Horeb in E and D³. Both cases appear to me the result of a distinct effort to separate the concept of the God of Israel from the ancient Worship of the Moon.

When writing in vol. X on “The Origin of the Tetra-

¹ Josh. xxiv. 2 (E² according to Bennett, the words which I have omitted being marked as a redactional addition).

² Ur in J², Gen. xi. 28, xv. 7, but in each passage marked by Ball as a redactional addition, in P, chap. xi. 31. Harran, on the other hand, is represented by J as the birth-place of Abraham, and the home of Laban, while in P it is merely a halting-place (a *long* halt) in the migration from Ur (*E. B.*, art. “Haran,” חֶרֶן).

³ ² in J, Exod. xix. 20, 23 and perhaps xxxiv. 2, 4 (*Lex.*). Cp. Deut. xxxiii. 2 (The Blessing of Moses), יְהוָה מֹשֶׁה בָּא, and in Num. x. 33 (J² according to Paterson), הָרַר יְהוָה; then note in Exod. iii. 1 (E), אֵל הָרַר, הָאֱלֹהִים חֶרֶב, and in 1 Kings xix. 8, הָאֱלֹהִים חֶרֶב.

grammaton," I pointed out that the formula by which the god of a community was invoked "would readily pass in usage into an appellation distinguishing the god himself in his character of tutelary deity, while on the other hand it would become at once the motto and the name of the city thus entrusted to his care." The palmary instance of this principle is furnished by the divine name Asshur, applied not only to the god, but to his people, his city, and his land¹. It may be worth while to ask whether the names of Ur and Harraṇ, of which the former is usually interpreted as equivalent to the Ass. *alu*, "city," and the latter as=*ḥarrānu*, "road," were not rather, in their primary signification, titles of the god there worshipped. In fact, the name Or, Our (thus transcribed by Maspero²) occurs as a divine title in the inscriptions of Sham'al, the modern Zinjirli, in the eighth century B.C.: a piece of evidence which has an important bearing upon a class of biblical words, names, and phrases, in which the same root is employed.

First among these I would place the well-known appellation of a considerable clan of the tribe Manasseh (settled, it may be observed, in Gilead, a region exposed to Aramaean influence), אֵייר, or as I should prefer to read it (in accordance with the principle suggested by Mr. G. Buchanan Gray³) אֵל אֵייר⁴, "God grant light." It is not in the daytime, in the climate of Syria, that light is sought or needed. Such a supplication can only be addressed to the chief luminary of the night.

In the proper name אֵרִיאֵל, as well as in the Phœnician אֵרִמְלֵךְ, the divinity of אֵר is affirmed, and in אֵרִיָה the god is identified with Jahveh. The last is especially important

¹ See, however, the note in *E.B.*, art. "Assyria," col. 349. The uncertain differences of form there mentioned were perhaps not original but adopted for convenience of distinction.

² *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient classique*, II, 155, n. 4.

³ *Hebrew Proper Names*, p. 218.

⁴ The form אֵרֵר is cited from the Greek of Num. xxxii. 41 [A]. *E.B.*, s. v. "Jair."

for our purpose. It was borne by three historic persons. The first of these was David's Hittite captain; and it may be presumed that it was bestowed upon him by his master¹. The second was the priest of Jahveh in the Temple of Jerusalem, in the age of Isaiah², and it may be added, an associate of that prophet. The third was himself a prophet who suffered martyrdom under Jehoiakim³. We are here in the main stream of Jewish tradition.

Suppose, now, that the Chaldean Ur derived its name from an epithet of the moon-god Sin or Nannar. There can, I think, be little room for doubt that the Biblical **אור כשדים** was originally so called to distinguish it from the *Uru-šalimmu* of the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, famous above all fame by its later name of Jerusalem⁴. But if *Uru* signifies the Moon, *šalimmu*, as Mr. G. Margoliouth has pointed out, means "complete." The very name of Jerusalem signifies Full Moon!

The same ingenious writer goes on to observe: "The ground-plan of Harran, the city sacred to Sin, described as we are told, 'a crescent-shaped curve in honour of its patron' (Maspero, *Struggle of the Nations*, p. 26). We are thus led to think that the term **שָׁלֵם** (Shalem) was meant to denote the moon-disk at its full, and that the city was, in honour of the god, so built as roughly to represent a circle⁵."

It is a real pleasure to illustrate and confirm this bold conjecture. Maspero's description of the plan of Harran is indeed a little less precise in the French, "La ville affectait vaguement en son honneur la forme courbe d'un croissant"⁶;

¹ He might have been born among foreign worshippers of the god known as Ur, whether these were Canaanite or Syrian.

² Note that in his time the cultus was affected by Syrian influences, 2 Kings xvi. 10-16, Isa. viii. 2.

³ Jer. xxvi. 20-23.

⁴ With an innocence truly charming in an Encyclopaedia, it is remarked (art. *Ur of the Chaldees*) that no other Ur is mentioned in the Old Testament.

⁵ *Hebrew-Babylonian Affinities* (a pamphlet published by Nutt, 1899), p. 14.

⁶ *Hist. anc. des peuples de l'Orient classique*, II, 26.

but the hypothesis derives strength from the facts that the ground-plan of the Chaldean Uru was an oval¹, which in the plan given by Maspero² from Taylor, bears an obvious, though unnoticed resemblance to the gibbous moon; while that of Larsam, which was sacred to the Sun-god Shamash, "formed almost a circle upon the soil." "A low circular platform, about four and a half miles in circumference," is the description of Loftus, from which that of Maspero is derived. On the other hand, "Uruk and Eridu resembled in shape a sort of irregular trapezium"; these cities were *not* dedicated to the heavenly bodies. And that it is no mere fancy to attribute significance and intention to the plans of ancient cities may be proved from the amusing Chinese examples given by Frazer (*G. B.*², I, 48, 49). The citations in the same work, II, 155 et seq., *ibid.* 457, illustrate the sympathetic and favourable influence upon the prosperity and increase of every human undertaking attributed to the waxing moon, and enable us to understand, not only the ground-plans of Harraṇ and Ur, but also the reason why "an ancient legend ascribes the invention of the bricks [of Chaldea³] and consequently the construction of the earliest cities, jointly to Sin, the eldest son of Bel, and Ninib his brother⁴." Now it is noteworthy that, as we learn from the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence, there was a Bît-Ninib⁵ belonging to Uru-šalimmu. It looks much as if Uru-šalimmu and Bît-Ninib were a joint foundation under Chaldean influence. I cannot doubt that the name אור-שלם was changed to ירושלים for precisely the

¹ *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 625.

² *Ibid.*, p. 612.

³ Cf. Gen. xi. 3.

⁴ *Dawn of Civ.*, p. 753. Ninib was, *inter alia*, a god of field-labour, *ibid.*, 576, n. 3. A point which may concern us in the character of this deity is his association with the planet Saturn. If the Sabbath be regarded as originally *dies Saturni*, then the celebration of New Moon and Sabbath at Jerusalem may be traced back to the cultus of Sin and Ninib. The labourer ceases work to worship (at the moon's phases) the divine patron of his toil.

⁵ Was Bît-Ninib perchance identical with Beth-lehem?

same reason that Sinai was changed to Horeb, and the feast of the New Moon ignored by the prophetic codes.

It is probable that the writer of Gen. xiv was acquainted with the original form, and that he has purposely modified it by omitting the divine name אור. It may indeed be considered that שלם also from an attribute might pass into a title, and is possibly so employed in the Phoenician יכנשלם¹. In translating the cognate terms of a foreign language, with reference to their derived or acquired meanings, by words which in our own tongue are not related to one another, we are liable to miss, not merely an external resemblance, but an underlying connexion in thought. Those who in ancient times ascribed to the waxing moon a propitious influence on the increase of their estate, would be likely when worshipping it at the full (שָׁלֵם) to impute to the blessing of the divinity the "wholeness" (שְׁלֹום) of their condition², the peace which in ages of war could only be secured by victory³. It is not then surprising that David who established the cultus of Jahveh in the city of אֵירֶשֶׁלָם, David whose Hittite captain bore the name of אורייה, should have bestowed upon his son that of אבישלום; like אברם, עמרם, or אבנר, an ascription of praise to the Moon-god. I would seek for the difficult שְׁלֹמָה a similar interpretation (cp. Judg. vi. 24, יהוה שלום).

As in Israel, Greece, and Rome, as in China, so in Babylonia, the God of Heaven, Anu, occupies the highest place⁴. To exalt therefore the Moon-god to supremacy, he must be identified with the Spirit of the Sky. And in the Hymn to Nannar this course is actually taken. So, too, the Moon is regarded as "lord of the hosts of heaven,"

¹ E. B., art. "Solomon."

² Cf. Lat. *integer, integritas*.

³ This equivalence of peace and victory appears curiously in the inscription of Uni (a minister of the Sixth Egyptian Dynasty), *Dawn of Civ.*, 4th ed., pp. 420, 421, with note comparing the expression "came in peace," with its Arabic counterpart *bi's-salāmah*.

⁴ See the general treatment of this topic in Tylor's *Primitive Culture*.

for as Mr. G. Margoliouth has acutely observed¹, "It was the moon who was seen to gather around him the glorious hosts of stars." In vol. XI, pp. 242, 243, I have dealt at some length with the myth of the *זבל*, the Mountain of the World, which is at the same time the Mountain of the gods, and which was symbolized by the staged temple-mounds of Chaldea, including that of Nannar at Uru, drawing the conclusion that the mythical *זבל* is the dwelling of *עליון*, and that *זבולן* and *בעל זבל* were originally equivalent to the latter deity, the Zeus of a Semitic Olympus; and pointing out that the expression *בית זבל* is applied by Solomon to the temple in a poetical citation which is probably derived from the *ספר הישר*, while the *בית זבל* of this passage (1 Kings viii. 13) is described as *עליון* in ix. 8. I have now to add that in Hab. iii. 11 it is the moon that stands in his *זבל*²; appears, that is to say, in the character of *בעל זבל*. It may well then be the deity of the moon who in Gen. xiv bears the name of *אל עליון*, has the king of Salem for his priest, and is invoked in oath by Abram³, who also accepts his blessing. The creative activity ascribed to the god must be discussed at a later stage. I must, however, lay stress upon the significant fact that the writer carries back the cultus of Jerusalem to an age when the first father of Israel was but a stranger in the land.

In the time of Amenophis IV, *circa* 1415 B. C., the city was in danger of falling into the hands of the H̄abiri. It did not fall into those of the Israelites until it was captured by David⁴. Before this crisis of its fortunes Jerusalem

¹ "The Earliest Religion of the Ancient Hebrews," *Contemp. Rev.*, Oct., 1898, p. 583.

² Should we not read *זבולן*? "The balance of the rhythm seems to require a separate predicate to 'the sun'," Davidson, in loc.

³ Gen. xiv. 22, where *יהוה* is probably a gloss.

⁴ Josh. xv. 63 (J), Judg. i. 21, xix. 11. "It seems probable that in the place of the problematical Adoni-bezek, king (ver. 7) of some nameless city, the original of Judg. i (J) had Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem." "Of the capture [ver. 8] . . . there is no trace in the history," Moore in *Internat. Crit. Comm.*

was occupied by a clan of whom we only know that they invoked their god with the significant appellation [יְבוּסִים], which is both explained and established by such passages as Ps. lx. 14, *וְהוּא יְבוּס צְרִינוּ בְּאֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה חֵיל* = eviii. 14. Cf. xliv. 6, *בֶּךָ צְרִינוּ נִנְּה בְּשֹׁמֵךְ נְבוּס קָמִינוּ*. Compare an authentic utterance of Isaiah xiv. 25, *לְשֹׁבֵר אֲשׁוּר בְּאַרְצִי וְעַל הָרֵי אֲבוּסֵנוּ*, as well as lxiii. 6 and Zech. x. 5, where the "trampling warriors" fight *כִּי יִהְיֶה עִמָּם*. Clearly, the "Jebusite" war-cry survived in the traditions of Jerusalem.

Assuming what David seems to have assumed, the identification of יהוה with אֱוֶר שְׁלֵם, I am now in a position to explain with some degree of confidence the nature of the mysterious אֱוֶרִים and תְּמִימִים. It appears from the corrected text of 1 Sam. xiv. 41 that these were in fact lots by means of which it was believed that Jahveh delivered a response to alternative inquiries. We may presume that in popular belief the god was *in* the lots¹, and that therefore they were attributes or symbols of him. I venture to suggest that the lot Urim, or "Brightness," represented the bright crescent of the Moon-god Ur; and the lot Tummim, that is, "Wholeness," the dim unlighted disk, "the Old Moon in the New Moon's arms"; that they were, in short, the familiar symbols of Phoenician art². These were perhaps the gods which "Rachel," i. e. Ashtoreth, stole from her father "Laban," or Sin.

In the interpretation of the Book of Genesis, we need, so to speak, not one key but a bunch. There is a large and delightful element which is neither mythical nor legendary nor historical but romantic. There is an element, perhaps even in the oldest sources, of artificial construction, a scheme of origins and relations. And then, underlying alike the genealogy and the romance, there are the

¹ Cf. *h. Hom. Merc.* 552 et seq., with the note in Lang's translation: "It appears from Philochorus that the prophetic lots were called *thriac*. They are then personified, as the prophetic Sisters, the *Thriac*."

² When I come to treat of Ashtoreth I shall have occasion to discuss these symbols at some length.

materials of which these are composed, the *dramatis personae*:—(1) the Tribe, which is regularly identified with (2) the Eponymous Ancestor, who in turn can hardly be distinguished from (3) the tribal god, whether we regard the last as a deified individual, or a divinity euhemerized. And under the influence of Jahvist monotheism the euhemerizing process has undoubtedly moulded the traditions transmitted to us, whatever their origin. We have also to bear in mind (a) that distinct, even though cognate or allied tribes, might worship similar or identical gods, by various appellations. I have already suggested that **ישראל**, **נפחלי** [**אל**], **יעקב** (**אל**), are predicates of one divine hero. And in the same way it is easy to suppose that the clan **יאיר** might adore the Moon-god as Giver of Light, while the whole House of Joseph invoked him as Giver of Increase, and yet another tribe called upon him to hear them from his heavenly mansion by the name of **זולן**. (b) For the purpose of the general scheme, it was necessary to exhibit the same Person in different connexions, and with this object variant synonyms were employed or even invented. It is only in gender that **אפרם** differs from **אפרת**, while **רבה** stands related to **רחל** as the stall-fed heifer¹ to the Ashtoreth of the flock².

The supposed identity of the "place-name" **חרן** with the Ass. *harrānu* = road has already been disputed by Winckler³, and the same scholar has also suggested that **תרה** is an intentional distortion of **יֵרֵחַ**⁴. My own belief is that **אור** and **חרן** and **נחור** and **תרה** and **לבן** are synonymous epithets for the moon. The **עיר נחור** of Gen. xxiv. 10. (J) is presumably identical with **חרן**. Now **נחור** and **מלכה**, on this hypothesis the Moon-god and his consort, are represented as the parents of **בְּחוּאֵל**, who is nothing else but a personification of the famous sanctuary, or, still more precisely, its primitive object of worship, the Sacred Stone (Gen. xxviii. 22). Can

¹ Cf. מרבק. עגלה.

³ E. B., art. "Haran," n. 4.

² Deut. vii. 13.

⁴ Ib., art. "Terah."

we then trace any connexion between the cultus of Sin and that of Bethel? I think we can.

As Osiris is at once a bull-god and a moon-god, as Hathor is the Sky, and at the same time a Cow, so in like manner is the god of Ur *the mighty bull of Anu*¹, that is, of Heaven. The synthesis, which to us appears so strange and monstrous, is in truth, as is proved by its recurrence, quite normal, and becomes intelligible when we have grasped the modes of thought of which it is the product. In accordance with the general doctrine of *Animism* a Spirit of the Sky must be assumed; and from all that we know of the thoughts of Early Man we may infer that he would regard this spirit as capable, like others, of taking the bodily form of the living creatures which surrounded him. The play of his fancy, though not limited by reflection, would be governed by the suggestions of circumstance. Thus it is natural enough that the sky-god should be conceived in the form of that strong-winged and keen-sighted denizen of the air, the Hawk. But what point of likeness or analogy can be found between the visible sky and the bodily semblance of a bull or cow? In fact there is one, and one only. It is to be found in *the horned Moon*. The moon's horns are those of the celestial cow or bull, just as at other times sun and moon are conceived as the eyes of Horus, the divine hawk. Thus a synthesis is formed in which the worship of Moon and Sky is associated with the religion of Pastoral Life. And further, in accordance with the doctrine of *Sympathy*, the ancient nomads of whom we speak, who depended for subsistence on their herds and flocks, would regard the influence of the waxing moon as the source of increase of their wealth. We shall now be prepared to understand the identity of the Bull of Anu with the Calf of Bethel and of Sinai.

I do not know if it has ever been pointed out that in

¹ *Dawn of Civ.*, p. 626 and p. 653, n. 6. The parallel shows how unsafe is the assumption that the lunar and pastoral attributes of Ashtoreth were borrowed in the first instance from Egypt.

tracing back the origin of the calf-worship to the foot of Horeb, and ascribing it to the act of Aaron, E is making a great, and, we may be sure, an unwilling concession, to the traditions of Bethel¹. Such a circumstance could never have been invented by an opponent of these rites. We may take it that he could not deny what was universally accepted, the Mosaic origin of the cult, any more than it was possible to deny that of the worship of Nehushtan; he could only give a hostile representation, or else an apologetic explanation of an undoubted fact. And if it originated at Horeb, or rather Sinai, it was presumably a cult of the god of Sinai, the god Sin, identified with Jahveh. But the prophets of Israel had good reason to repudiate it. It was a lascivious and orgiastic worship. "The people," we are told in E (Exod. xxxii. 6), "sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play," יָצְחָק. Dr. Frazer has shown us that the practice of sexual intercourse in connexion with ritual observance has a wider signification than that of mere indulgence. On the principle of Sympathetic Magic it was believed to promote the fertility of crops². And further, there is reason to believe that in some cases the human agents were considered to enact the union of a divine pair. Certainly we cannot suppose that the bull-god was in theory without a mate, or that his worshippers attributed to him a chastity greater than their own. Here then is the deity of whom יָצָחֵק is a fitting predicate, and here is the origin of the folk-tale in Gen. xxvi. 8. יָצָחֵק מִצָּחֵק אֶת רַבְקָה אִשְׁתּוֹ is, on this theory, the bull-god playing with the heifer his mate.

The establishment of a cult requires the sanction of the god, and is usually therefore ascribed to himself or his representative. In this case it is the work of אֶהְרֵן, a name

¹ [Prof. Kennett's paper on "The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood" was not yet published when the present article was passed for press by the writer. See January number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*.]

² *The Golden Bough*, 2nd ed., vol. II, p. 204 and seq.; vol. III, p. 166 and seq.

which has never yet received a satisfactory explanation. I venture to regard it as a divine name, parallel both in form and meaning to that of אפרים, and derived from the root הרה—signifying therefore *him that maketh pregnant*, or *causeth to conceive*. No epithet could be more appropriate.

In the endeavour to gain an insight into the traditions of Bethel we must, I think, postulate three successive strata of belief and worship:—

(1) The cultus of the Stone, set up by יעקב-אל.

(2) That of the divinity of the Flock, whether *fem.* רחל, אפרת or *masc.* אפרים, the latter also addressed by the invocation יוספאל.

(3) Of the deity of the Herd, *fem.* רבקה, *masc.* אהרן ; יצחק also refers to this god ¹.

It is probable that the third incorporated and modified elements derived from the second. For as Dr. Benzinger points out, the nomads of the wilderness did not breed cattle ². And I must add that though "Isaac" has "Rebekah" for his wife, yet the victim substituted for him in boyhood is not a calf but a ram ³. It would seem then that if Beth-el owed anything to Sinai, it must be the second element of her cultus, rather than the third. If, on the other hand, the last is connected with the cultus of Sin, it is more probably derived from Harran.

The god of Harran, according to Maspero, was worshipped under the form of a conical stone, perhaps an aerolite surmounted by a gilded crescent ⁴. The conical stone was indeed a common habitation or embodiment of divinities, both male and female, over a wide area ⁵. And it is not at

¹ For גִּית אֵין, implied in גִּית אֵין (Lex.), cf. גִּית לָחֶם.

² E. B., art. "Calf."

³ Gen. xxii. 13.

⁴ Hist. anc. des peuples de l'Orient classique, II, 26.

⁵ See Perrot and Chipiez, *Phoenicia* (Eng. trans.), vol. I, Figs. 19, 29, 30, 58, 192, 199, 202, 205, 206, 223, 232, and tail-piece to chap. iv; *References in text*, vol. I, pp. 61, 62; 79, 80; 275, 276; 280; 283; 307; 315; 319; 348; vol. II, pp. 236, 237 (figs. 153, 156); p. 242 (figs. 165, 167);

all improbable that the Ark of Jahveh originally contained just such a stone, hallowed by anointing to secure the objective presence of the god amid his people.

Traditions, we may confidently assume, concerning the *instrumenta* of the cultus must have lingered in the exiled priesthood from the age of Ezekiel to that of Ezra. When therefore, in the later strata of the Priestly Code, the ark, with its attendant cherubim of gold (Exod. xxxvii. 1, 7), and the sacred objects of the ideal tabernacle, are ascribed to the inspired artificer יהודה למטה חור (Exod. xxxi. 2), the statement is not to be dismissed without inquiry into its significance. The name בצלאל has a parallel in the Phœnician ביראל, and may point to memories of Phœnicians employed by Solomon, or to the mythical prototype and patron of these craftsmen, such as the Egyptian Thoth or the Cretan Daidalos. אורי, a mutilated form, recalls the priest אוריה, already mentioned, who built the new altar under Ahaz. (At this time also Phœnician artists may have been employed.) At the head of this little genealogy stands one חור, whom I am inclined to identify with the associate of Aaron in E (Exod. xvii. 10-12, xxiv. 14), a figure so dignified in position, yet so unimportant to the narrative, that it must, I think, have had place and function in previous tradition. What if he were regarded as the maker of the ark, and were in truth identical with חור and הור? In fact in the Septuagint he appears as Ωρ¹.

Wherever the full moon was seen to rise in its glory from behind a range of mountains—Sinai, or Lebanon, or those which part the plains of Tigris and Euphrates from Persia²—his worshippers might naturally regard these lofty summits as the god's true mansion or זבל. Such a conception may perhaps underlie the obscure proverb and p. 378 ad fin. Also Lanciani's *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, 1897, pp. 134, 160.

¹ For epithets appropriate to the moon, compare σελήνη "plainly akin to σέλας as Lat. *luna* (*Lucina*) to *luceo*," Liddell and Scott.

² For instance, the mountains of Nizir, on which in the Babylonian legend, the ark found preservation.

in Gen. xxii. 14: בָּהָר יִהְיֶה יְרֵאָה, "Jahveh appeareth in the mountain¹." And if, after all that has been said, I may now assume that the god of Uru-šalimmu was indeed the Full Moon, we shall the better understand why, in the vision of Ezekiel, the glory of the God of Israel entered the temple by the eastern gate, coming from the way of the east; וְהָאֵרֶץ הָאִירָה מִכְבְּדוֹ (Ezek. xliii. 2, xliv. 2).

If יהוה or יהו be grammatically equivalent to יהיה or יהי, and if the deity thus invoked were once identified with the god אֵל or אֱלֹהִים; it follows that this appellation may legitimately be interpreted in the sense of the Creative Word, יהי אֵל, *Let there be Light*. Creation, on this view, began with the utterance of the Name; and the First Day, with the first rising of the Moon.

In this sense, the salutation יהוה אֵל, or יהו אֵל, might naturally be employed as a ritual greeting on the appearance of the luminary, and from this use might readily be transferred to the myth of its creation². We can then see both the reason why Moses chose it to invoke the God of Sinai, and also why in E, and all subsequent texts, this meaning is replaced by the interpretation which I have hitherto adopted, *God will be with us*.

It is not at all an improbable supposition, that the author of the Priestly Code, who fetches Abram from Ur of the Chaldees, may have derived thence the main outlines of his cosmogony. The traditions, on this subject, of Chaldea would reach him with the prestige of antiquity and authority. He would regard them as not wholly alien, a testimony, authentic although corrupted in transmission, to the Truth which Israel alone possessed in purity. And that his materials were in fact borrowed from a foreign source, may be proved not only from the polytheistic language of Gen. i. 26, 27, but still more clearly from the rationale of idolatry which these verses imply. If Man is created in the image of God, it follows

¹ Compare the language of Ps. cxxi.

² It is in fact the exact equivalent of the tribal appellation אֵלִים.

that God has human form, and that the artificer is justified in thus representing him. It is indeed possible that P intended a protest against the conception of deities bearing the forms of animals, the denizens of water, earth, or air (cp. Exod. xx. 4). But contrast the language of II Isaiah!

We may presume that in general the natural order of creation as conceived by the Babylonian mind would correspond to the established order of the gods, the triad of Heaven (Gen. i. 8), Earth, and Sea (vv. 9, 10), the provinces of Anu, Bel, and Ea, taking precedence of that which was composed by Sin, Shamash, and Ishtar, the Moon, the Sun, and the brightest among the Planets¹ (cp. Gen. i. 14-19). But where, as at Uru, the Moon-god was exalted to the supreme place by identification with the God of Heaven, this order could not be maintained. It was now (we may believe) supposed that Time, the succession of days and seasons², began with the first moon-rise, and that the Light of the Moon was the *לְאוֹר הַיָּסוֹד*, the first and chiefest part, of God's creation³. To the Moon-god, as in

¹ For these triads see Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.*, pp. 538, 649 ad fin., 650, 658, 662. Ramman afterwards replaced Ishtar.

² Compare Gen. viii. 22 (*J*²) with i. 14.

³ Gen. i. 1-3. Read *בְּרִאשִׁית קָוָא*. The *Beth* is the *Beth essentialis*. The apodosis commences at *וַיֵּאמֶר*. Compare Wellh., *Proh.*, Eng. trans., p. 387, and see below on Prov. viii. 22. The construction here placed upon Gen. i. 1-3 makes it necessary to take the clauses ... *וַיֵּאמֶר*, ... *וַיֵּשֶׁב*, ... *וַיֵּרָא*, as temporal, the articles of a long protasis. Smend (cited by Addis) objects to such an involved period as "against the genius of Hebrew." With good reason; the writer was paraphrasing a foreign source. The proof of this lies in the fact that the Babylonian Creation-epic opens precisely in this manner. And the same phenomenon is presented by the opening of J, Gen. ii. 4^b-6. The apodosis begins ver. 7, *וַיֵּצֵר*.

Parallels may be found in a wide range of sources, from the "strange old song" of the Dinkas, quoted by Mr. Lang (I think in *The Making of Religion*, but have not the volume at hand), to a well-known hymn of the Rig-Veda (*Mandala* X, 121, if I may trust my memory) which commences: "In the Beginning was neither Anything nor Nought," not *anything*, since that would presuppose creation; nor yet *nothing*, since *ex nihilo nihil fit*. A narrative of creation must begin by answering two questions: (1) What existed before anything was *made*? (2) What

his proper nature the Source of Increase of all things capable of growth—*auctor* (so to speak) *crescentium*—as well as in his secondary character of the Heavenly Bull, who is at the same time the “begetter of gods and men,” the Origin of Life might well be attributed by his worshippers. And where the soul or spirit is identified with the breath, a life-giving power may naturally be ascribed to the wind, regarded as the Breath of Heaven (cp. Gen. ii. 7 with i. 2). We may therefore read without surprise in the Hymn to Nannar how his decree “blows above like the wind, and stall and pasture become fertile”; it “is accomplished upon earth below, and the grass and green things grow”; it “is seen in the cattle-folds and in the lairs of the wild beasts, and it multiplies living things.” And the creative decrees of Gen. i. 11, 20 (cf. verse 2 b), 24, operate in like manner. But it must be observed that the God of Israel is never represented as, in a literal sense, the father of gods and men; and that if, as is likely enough, such a conception existed in popular thought—e.g. among the worshippers at Bethel—then, this is one of those elements in the common religion of antiquity which the teachers of Israel have silently set aside.

The decrees of the Hymn to Nannar, equally with those of Gen. i, may be regarded as the commands of an all-powerful sovereign. But it is probable that the conception of the Creative Word goes back to a mode of thought older than political authority, as old perhaps as those beginnings of speech when the inarticulate cry passed into the imperative call for common action. This is the notion that the utterance of a formula possesses an inherent power to produce the effect desired, a notion which (like others hereafter to be discussed) is common ground to Magic and Religion. So, in the cosmogony of Heliopolis, Tâmû, on the day of creation, had “cried across the waters, ‘Come unto me,’ and immediately the mysterious lotus had un-

happened before anything was *done*? “In the Beginning,” says Faust, “was the Deed.”

folded its petals, and Râ had appeared at the edge of its open cup as a disk, a new-born child, or a disk-crowned sparrow-hawk¹." In that of Hermopolis, Thot, a Moon-god, lord of the voice, master of words, of books, of incantations, "had opened his lips, and the voice which proceeded from him had become an entity; sound had solidified into matter, and by a simple emission of voice the four gods who preside over the four houses of the world had come forth alive from his mouth without bodily effort on his part, and without spoken evocation²." In the Babylonian "Creation-epic," when Marduk is chosen by the gods to be their champion against Tiâmat, they first invest him with the supreme *imperium*, the *fata* of Heaven³, "the attributes of a king," and then it is related how

They clad their champion in a garment, and thus addressed him: "Thy will, master, shall be that of the gods. Speak the word, 'Let it be so,' it shall be so. Thus open thy mouth, this garment shall disappear; say unto it, 'Return,' and the garment shall be there." He spoke with his lips, the garment disappeared; he said unto it, "Return," and the garment was restored⁴.

The king, as representative of divinity, has a prophetic character, and gives utterance to the self-fulfilling Word of God⁵. We cannot, I think, doubt that in the creed of Uru, the same power would be attributed to "Father Nannar."

A less august but more artistic method of creation is employed in the Making of Man. It is the craft of the Potter, or perhaps in a more advanced civilization, the Sculptor's art. We may compare the *process* mentioned in J (Gen. ii. 7, 19 ויצר) with the *result* described in P

¹ *Dawn of Civ.*, p. 140: "It was on this account that the Egyptians named the first day of the year the *Day of Come-unto-me!*"

² *Ibid.*, pp. 145, 146.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 539. Maspero does not employ the Latin terms, but they afford a paraphrase which is both convenient and exact.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 540. Compare the miracles which evidence the prophetic mission of Moses, Exod. iv. 1-9 (J).

⁵ Isa. ix. 7, lv. 10, 11.

(i. 26, 27 רמות, צלם). And so among the gods of Egypt, "Pthah had modelled man with his own hands; Khnûmû had formed him on a potter's table¹." In Chaldea, too, Ea "was a potter, and had modelled men out of the clay of the plains²," while a legend related by Berosus told how Marduk "begged his father Ea to cut off his head and mix clay with the blood which welled from the trunk, then from this clay to fashion new beasts and men³."

An entirely distinct conception is set forth in three of the most splendid passages of the post-exilic literature—Isa. xl. 12–14, Prov. viii. 22–31, Job xxxviii. 4 et seq. In these the Universe, the framework of Heaven, Earth, and Sea, is regarded as an architectural construction. Their materials must be measured and weighed (Isa. xl. 12). The foundations of the earth are laid like those of a building, and its plan marked out with the line (Job xxxviii. 4). This implies the trained skill, or counsel, of the craftsman. Who then was the Architect of the Great King? The Second Isaiah (xl. 13, 14) states this supposition only to reject it, as he presently rejects (ver. 18) the anthropomorphism which is accepted in Gen. i. 26, 27. But in the one sublime passage of the Book of Proverbs (a passage which must be reckoned among the great formative influences of Christian theology) the divine architect, standing in a subaltern relation to the Creator, is identified with the Wisdom which is presupposed in creation. And, like the Light of Genesis, the Wisdom of Proverbs is the first-fruit of God's way and works, ראשית דרכו קדם מפעליו. If there were any doubt as to the mythical origin of the conception here presented in so ennobled a form, the doubt is removed by one clearly mythic touch, when Wisdom is described in language more appropriate to the Bull of Anu, or the Calf of Bethel, as

¹ *Dawn of Civ.*, p. 156. Cf. p. 128, esp. n. 2.

² *Ibid.*, p. 653.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 545. Cf. p. 540, n. 2. The *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (art. "Creation," § 15, n. 4) commends the more prudent course of cutting off the head of Tîamat, on the quaint ground that it stands to reason.

משחקת לפני. It is no doubt a sense of this incompatibility which has led scholars such as Frank, Toy, and Haupt to read in ver. 30, אֶמֶן, in the sense of *nursling*, for אֶמֶן, *master-workman*. Be that as it may, the whole tenor of the context requires us to conceive this first-fruit of Creation in the character of a δημιουργός. And this Architect of the Universe, identified with the אֵל of Gen. i. 3, is in my opinion no other than that inventor of the building art, the Moon-god of Ur and Haran. It should be observed that in Job xxxviii. 4-7 the Creator appears in the character of Lord of Hosts (though that term is not employed) already attended by the Stars of Morn—the morning of the First Day, *before* the rising of the Sun.

It was then, we may suppose, this Builder of the World, assuredly regarded as the Founder of Ur-Kasdim, and perhaps also of Urusalem, who in Gen. xiv appears as the god of Salem, אֵל עִלִּין קִנָּה שָׁמַיִם וְאָרֶץ, and of whom it is said in the citation from the book of Jashar to which I have previously referred, that he set (ἔστησεν = הָכִין) the sun in the heavens, yet hath determined to dwell in darkness—a point to which we may have occasion to recur. He, as I believe, it was, who was invoked in the Phœnician proper name יִכְנִשְׁלָם, and upon the twin pillars placed in front of the Temple, which bore, as I shall venture to affirm, not the unmeaning names of Jachin and Boaz but the significant inscription יִכִּין בַּעַל. It is a remarkable circumstance that this formula, and the names of ancient kings, מְלִכֵּי־צֶדֶק, אֲדֹנֵי־צֶדֶק, have alike their parallels in those which were borne by the last sovereigns of Judah, הַיְּהוֹיָכִין and צִדְקִיָּהוּ¹.

¹ The conception of the divine Founder, expressed in יִכְנִשְׁלָם and יִכִּין בַּעַל, is also implied in the traditional form יְרוּשָׁלַם, if that be derived from the root ירה, and signify "Foundation of Shalem." Cf. Isa. xxviii. 16, Job xxxviii. 6 b. The *Qerē perpetuum* represents a further sophistication, disguising the associations of שָׁלָם.

In order to constitute Jerusalem the capital of Israel, it was a religious and political necessity to identify the god of Jerusalem with the god of Israel. The names אֲדֹנֵי־אֱבִירָה, compared with אֲבִישָׁלֹם, and אֲדֹנֵי־אֱרִיָּה compared

The reader has perhaps observed that I am accustomed to assume, provisionally, that the older narratives of the Pentateuch represent real traditions and adumbrate historic facts; not because I regard them as authoritative, but because I consider this assumption, where the contrary cannot be proved, the best way to elicit their true intention and significance. Now just as the Ark, the Serpent, and the Calf are traced back in these traditions to the age of Moses, so the two עמודים which stood before the temple at Jerusalem, and were presumably symbols of the god within—upon my view the god אֵל, or אֵלִי—being in fact, as Robertson Smith made it probable, candelabra or cressets such as are shown upon the coins of Cyprus before the temple of Paphos, the sanctuary of a lunar deity¹—had also their prototype in the legendary עמוד of alternate cloud and fire, by day and night, wherein Jahveh led his people through the wilderness. It may well be that this impressive image is actually derived from the fires of the temple cressets, smouldering in the sunshine and glowing after nightfall, dim or radiant like the Lamp of Night. In both cases the smoke conceals and the fire manifests the very presence of the deity. Compare the language of Gen. xv. 17, and the names of אֲבִנֵר and נִרְיָה. This double aspect of the God of Sinai runs all through the Theophanies of Exodus, but appears with especial clearness in that of Exod. xxxiii. 23 וַרְאִיתָ אֶת אַחֲרֵי וּפְנֵי לֹא יֵרָאוּ.

We shall now be prepared to apprehend the significance with the ancient אֲרִיזוֹק, are memorials of this compromise. It is of some importance to observe that in this way ritual and mythical traditions of *Chaldean origin*, attached to the local cult, may have been incorporated among those of Judah, and perhaps have left their traces in our oldest source.

¹ *Religion of the Semites*, 2nd ed., pp. 487 ad fin., 488. "In most of the Assyrian examples it is not easy to draw the line between the candelabrum and the sacred tree crowned with a star or crescent moon." For the coins of Cyprus, showing both star and crescent surmounting the temple with its sacred Cone and Candelabra, see Perrot and Chipiez, *Phoenicia*, Eng. trans., vol. I, figs. 58, 199. Cf. figs. 81, 82, 83, and 232 (Stele from Libybaeum).

of the terms employed in that solemn invocation of the God of Israel, the Blessing of Num. vi. 24. *יברכך יהוה וישמרך*, this is the Unsleeping Guardian of Ps. cxxi, the divine Keeper of Israel, who, as I believe, bestowed his title of *יאר שמרן* upon the capital of the northern kingdom¹. *יאר יהוה* ישא יהוה *יאר יהוה*—thus was he invoked by the clan *יאר*—*פניו אליך ויהנך*—so was he worshipped by the king who named his son *אבישלום*.

Turn now to the Talmudical citations which I owe to the pamphlet of Mr. George Margoliouth: "He who pronounces the benediction on the new moon at the proper time is like one who welcomes the very presence of the Divine Glory," and again, "If Israel had only been favoured to welcome the face of their Father which is in heaven once in the month, it would have been sufficient for them²." We are now in a position to perceive the literal meaning of *יאר פניו*, *ישא פניו*. All these expressions, later on so marvellously spiritualized, afford, in my opinion, the evidence of a very simple and natural myth by which the bright Moon was regarded as the Face of the Sky-god, Lord of Heaven³, and Leader of the starry Hosts, *בעל השמים* or *צבאות*. From this supposition there follows an important consequence. The "place-names," Israelite or Phœnician, *פנואל*, *פנבעל*, *θεοῦ πρόσωπον*, may now be regarded as epithets of the deity worshipped in these spots, the lunar god. This then was the mysterious antagonist with whom Jacob wrestled until the breaking of the day, but who was then obliged to part with him⁴! The myth is transparent. The wrestling-bout of the hero with the god serves to account for the monthly obscuration,

¹ "That this place derives its name from a man called Shemer (*שמר*, 1 Kings xvi. 24) is very unlikely." Nöldeke in *E. B.*, art. "Names," § 10.

² *Hebrew-Babylonian Affinities*, Appendix, citing Tractate Sanhedrin, fol. 42 a.

³ In other words: "The god who dwells in the heaven," to whom the heavens belong." There is no difference.

⁴ Gen. xxxii. 31 proves that this was the god of Penuel.

or else the occasional eclipse, of the moon's light¹. In one point of view, Jacob's opponent is identical with his old master Laban, and this consideration will enable us to understand some of the obscure and confused details in the story of his service. During two weeks of years he serves for the daughters of Laban, and meanwhile the flocks of his master increase from little to multitude². These are now partitioned between master and man, and as I must suppose the white were originally assigned to Laban—i.e. the bright moon—and the dark or mottled to his antagonist. From this point the increase is in Jacob's favour, until the sons of Laban make complaint, "of that which was our father's hath he gotten all this glory" (כבוד), and then—a mythical touch—we are told (xxx. 2 E): וירא יעקב את פני לבן והנה איננו עמו כחמול שלשום. In the event the riches of Laban are transferred to his servant, now become his rival (ver. 16). It has taken in all a period of twenty years to accomplish this result (vers. 38, 41), and we hear but without details (vers. 7, 41) that Jacob's wages have been changed ten times. These ten changes cannot be fitted into the six preceding years, since they must have coincided with the breeding season. E may have had before him a form of the story in which Jacob served ten years for the elder, ten for the younger daughter, and ten for the flock, making up a full month of years, reckoned not by weeks but by decades.

On the whole these narratives seem to point at once to a real parallel and a conscious rivalry between the God of Aram and the God of Israel, to whose favour (xxx. 5, 7, 13, 24, 29, 42, 53) Jacob's prosperity is due. In the verse last cited while Laban, as I understand, invokes the god of Harran, Jacob calls to witness him of Bethel. What if יצחק (אביו) stand for an original יצחק בעל, and so,

¹ Compare Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.*, pp. 92, 93, for Egyptian, and p. 634 for Chaldean myths on this topic.

² Gen. xxx. 29, 30.

perhaps *צלבעל* for *צלפחד*¹? It was, I presume, the Syrian deity whose blessing Jacob extorted—a reconciled antagonist. If so, at Penuel he was identified with the God of Israel.

As in Canaan, so at Carthage, the moon was reputed the Face of the Lord of Heaven; and when the Carthaginian paid his vows *לאם לרבת פנבעל*², he did but address the goddess in that character in which in fact she is represented on her stelai, as Mother and Mistress of the Moon, nursing the Disk and Crescent like a babe between her breasts³. To this subject I shall have occasion to recur.

More than a quarter of a century ago, a lad watching the glory of the August moon above the waves upon our southern coast, in the hours preceding an eclipse, sought expression for the feelings thus inspired in lines, which the "natural piety" acknowledged by a better poet impels me to rescue from oblivion. If the reader will grant me this indulgence, he will perhaps find in them an unconscious illustration of what is so impressively avowed in Deut. iv. 19 and in Job xxxi. 26.

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.

RHYTHM OF THE MOON-WORSHIPPERS.

O thou who art ever changing,
O thou who art eternally unchanged,
Heavenly Orb,

hear us.

Pure Beauty,
Serene Glory,
Goddess of the Night,

hear us.

¹ *J. Q. R.*, XI, 259, 260.

² For the fact, see *E. B.*, art. "Phoenicia," § 12, col. 3747.

³ For the meaning, turn to Perrot and Chipiez, *Phoenicia*, Eng. trans., vol. I, fig. 192; cf. vol. II, fig. 61.

Friend of the sick,
Guide of travellers,
Guard of the sleeping world,
hear us.

Throne in heaven,
Crown of the starry glory,
Mother of lights,
hear us.

Be we thine,
Be thou ours,
Glorious and beautiful,
True and lovely,
Be thou all.